

### III. REMARKS

Applicants have considered the current Office Action with mailing date of October 30, 2008. Claims 1-4, 7-12, 16-21 and 24-26 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended. The present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Office. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of these original claims and other claims in one or more subsequent patent applications that claim(s) priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the specification is objected to as claim 10 recites “computer recordable medium” and the specification does not define computer recordable medium. Applicants traverse this objection and point to paragraphs [00015] and [00042] of the specification. In paragraph [00015] it is stated “Figure 1 depicts an OLAP database system 10 that processes SQL queries 12 to obtain/process data from database 16. OLAP database system 10 can be implemented utilizing any type of *computer system having the necessary hardware and software systems* to implement the features described below”. Paragraph [00042] reproduced below states:

“It is understood that the systems, functions, mechanisms, methods, and modules described herein can be implemented in hardware, software, or a combination of hardware and software. They may be implemented by any type of computer system or other apparatus adapted for carrying out the methods described herein. *A typical combination of hardware and software could be a general-purpose computer system with a computer program that, when loaded and executed, controls the computer system such that it carries out the methods described herein.* Alternatively, a specific use computer, containing specialized hardware for carrying out one or more of the functional tasks of

the invention could be utilized. The present invention can also be embedded in a computer program product, which comprises all the features enabling the implementation of the methods and functions described herein, and which - when loaded in a computer system - is able to carry out these methods and functions. Computer program, software program, program, program product, or software, in the present context mean any expression, in any language, code or notation, of a set of instructions intended to cause a system having an information processing capability to perform a particular function either directly or after either or both of the following: (a) conversion to another language, code or notation; and/or (b) reproduction in a different material form.”

From these passages it is clear that the invention is loaded onto a computer system, having some type of storage for a computer program. Applicants request withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 1, 10 and 19 are objected to because the claims contain the limitation “wherein the normalizing results in a saved time per MB that is determined by the change in performance time for a summary table divided by the change in size for a summary table”. The Office states it is unclear whether or not the same summary table is being referred to in each instance. Applicants have amended claims 1, 10 and 19 to make clear that normalized results refer to the same summary.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-9, 10-12, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, first paragraph, as allegedly lacking the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. Applicants have amended claim 1 to state that the at least one computer device includes the recited systems. This provides the necessary interrelationship between the computer device and the systems. Turning to claims 10-12 and 15-18, Applicants have shown above that computer readable medium is described in the specification and the technology easily understandable to a person skilled in the art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections of claims 1-4, 6-9, 10-12, and 15-18 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 7-12, 16-21, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bakalash et al. (US Patent 6,385,604) in view of Brickell et al. (US Patent 6,385,604), and further in view of Witkowski et al. (US Patent 7,379,933), herein “Bakalash”, “Brickell”, and “Witkowski” respectively. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bakalash in view of Brickell, in view of Witkowski, and further in view of Dias et al. (US Patent 6,317,778), hereinafter “Dias”. Applicants respectfully traverse the Office’s rejections on the followings grounds.

With regard to the Office’s 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections, Applicants assert that the Office fails to show that Bakalash in view of other sources teaches, suggests, or makes obvious each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to amended claim 1 (and similarly claims 10 and 19), Applicants assert that the references fail to make obvious, *inter alia*, “a system for normalizing performance measures determined for summary tables that are based on different fact tables, wherein the normalizing results in a saved time per MB that is determined by the change in performance time for a summary table divided by the change in size for the summary table.”

The Office cites Brickell col. 8, lines 35-44, in order to show the above subject matter. Applicants have reviewed the cited material and assert that nowhere does Brickell teach or suggest “a system for normalizing performance measures.” Brickell merely discloses a Summary to Detail Reduction Factor (SDR), which is a value between 0 and 1 formed by the division of the number of rows in a new summary table by the number of rows in the summary table it replaces. Brickell discloses an example, “a summary table that contains 250 rows of data, which is used in place of using detail tables which have 1000 rows, the reduction factor would be

250/1000 or 0.25” (Brickell col. 8, lines 37-44). Since Brickell’s SDR makes no comparison between different factors (i.e. time and space), it fails to normalize the performance measure and allow for comparison between summary tables as recited in the independent claims. Brickell’s SDR needs additional information in order to create any form of standardization; for example, Brickell points out that the SDR must be applied to “average execution time per day” (col. 8, lines 51-52) in order to make useful estimations. Assuming, *arguendo*, that Brickell teaches a system for normalizing, Brickell still fails to teach normalizing that results in a “saved time per MB that is determined by the change in performance time for a summary table divided by the change in size for a summary table” (claim 1). Brickell’s SDR, as disclosed above, is a storage to storage comparison that results in a factor with no units. Such a factor is not equivalent to a saved time per MB normalization, because such a factor is not formed by the division of change in performance time by change in size.

In finding this argument unpersuasive, the Office states that Brickell teaches “wherein the normalizing results in a saved time per MB that is determined by the change in performance time for a summary table divided by the change in size for the summary table” by citing col. 8, lines 28-65. The Office asserts that SDR is a change in size for a summary table in that it is determined by the difference in size between a fact table and a summary table. This statement is incorrect. SDR is a ratio based on the size of the summary table divided by the size of the fact table. A summary table that contains 250 rows of data used in place of a fact table having 1000 rows of data would have an equivalent SDR to a summary table that contains 25,000 rows of data used in place of a fact table having 100,000 rows of data. Yet the summary table containing 25,000 rows of data would require more storage space. Thus, storage space or saved time per

MB is never determined in Brickell. The Office also cites col. 9, lines 12-23 and Fig. 3 of Brickell as teaching Applicants' normalization element. However, as taught in Brickell, Fig. 3 applies to the case where there is an absence of workload statistics (col. 9, lines 1-6). Thus, Brickell teaches that Fig. 3 is not combinable with a system using query or workload statistics. Moreover, Brickell in Fig. 3 does not teach a normalization element. It is a graph of query performance improvement versus disc space for every possible summary table. Fig. 3 of Brickell does not provide normalizing results in a saved time per MB that is determined by the change in performance time for a summary table divided by the change in size for the summary table.

With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicants will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserves the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejections.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carl F. Ruoff/

---

Carl F. Ruoff  
Reg. No.: 34,241

Date: December 18, 2008

Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
Telephone (518) 449-0044  
Facsimile (518) 449-0047